



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/917,200	07/27/2001	Jonathan Stern	2937.1000-007	8393

21005 7590 01/05/2005

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.
530 VIRGINIA ROAD
P.O. BOX 9133
CONCORD, MA 01742-9133

EXAMINER

HWANG, JOON H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2162

DATE MAILED: 01/05/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/917,200

Applicant(s)

STERN ET AL.

Examiner

Joon H. Hwang

Art Unit

2162

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 02 July 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 3/29/04, 6/14/04, 8/30/04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. The applicant amended claims 1, 9, and 15 in the amendment received on 7/2/04.
2. The pending claims are 1-19.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 9, and 15 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

The applicants added in claims 1, 9, and 15 the limitations of using automated means, extracting from a global computer network unstructured information about individual people. This limitation is addressed in the following rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 and 5-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,016) in view of Brady et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,430).

With respect to claims 1 and 5, Stuntebeck discloses extracting from a global computer network information about individual people and storing the extracted

information in a database including for each person a respective record holding at least name of the person and the name of a respective current employer (abstract, fig. 1, lines 9-54 in col. 2, lines 28-55 in col. 3, and lines 28-54 in col. 4). Stuntebeck discloses enabling people named in the database to access respective records, the enabling access being in a manner that enables each respective person to edit the data in his record of the database such that the database is maintained and continually updated by the person named in the database (lines 52-55 in col. 3). Stuntebeck does not explicitly disclose extracting such information by using automated means. However, Brady discloses extracting unstructured information about individual people by using automated means, such as web crawlers, spiders, and Harvester and updating a database (line 56 in col. 6 thru line 26 in col. 7, lines 22-63 in col. 8, and line 53 in col. 20 thru line 11 in col. 21) so that the database storing such extracted information is automatically built and integrity of the information in the database is maintained. Therefore, based on Stuntebeck in view of Brady, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Brady to the system of Stuntebeck in order to automatically build a database storing extracted information about individual people.

With respect to claim 6, Stuntebeck teaches the respective record further holds job title of the person and querying the database by name and job title (lines 30-36 in col. 2, lines 27-54 in col. 4, and lines 11-40 in col. 5).

With respect to claim 7, the limitations of claim 7 are similar to the limitations of claims 1 and 6. Stuntebeck also discloses information about a company or organization

(abstract, fig. 1, lines 9-54 in col. 2, lines 28-55 in col. 3, and lines 28-54 in col. 4).

Brady also discloses extracting information about a company or organization by an automated means (lines 22-63 in col. 8). Therefore, the limitations of claim 7 are rejected in the analysis of claims 1 and 6 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

6. Claims 2, 8, 15, 16, and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,016) in view of Brady et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,430), and further in view of Robertson (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,369).

With respect to claim 2, Stuntebeck and Brady disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except notifying a third party data system for a data update. However, Robertson discloses linking providing a communication link from a desired record in the database to a third party data system, updating the data in the desired record linked to the third party data system, and using the communication link, notifying the third party data system of the updated data in the desired record such that the third party data system employs the updated data in maintaining data of the third party data system (abstract, fig. 5, fig. 14, lines 12-21 in col. 3, lines 42-45 in col. 4, lines 48-54 in col. 6, lines 50-58 in col. 11, lines 25-44 in col. 12, and line 42 in col. 15 thru line 21 in col. 16). Therefore, based on Stuntebeck in view of Brady, and further in view of Robertson, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Robertson to the system of

Stuntebeck in order to maintain databases synchronized, so that the information maintained in the databases is kept current and complete.

With respect to claim 8, the limitations of claim 8 are similar to the limitations of claim 2. Therefore, the limitations of claim 8 are rejected in the analysis of claim 2 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

With respect to claims 15 and 16, Stuntebeck discloses extracting from a global computer network information about individual people and storing the extracted information in a database (abstract, fig. 1, lines 9-54 in col. 2, lines 28-55 in col. 3, and lines 28-54 in col. 4). Stuntebeck does not explicitly disclose extracting unstructured information about individual people and organizations. However, Brady discloses extracting unstructured information about individual people by using automated means, such as web crawlers, spiders, and Harvester and updating a database (line 56 in col. 6 thru line 26 in col. 7, lines 22-63 in col. 8, and line 53 in col. 20 thru line 11 in col. 21) so that the database storing such extracted information is automatically built and integrity of the information in the database is maintained. Therefore, based on Stuntebeck in view of Brady, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Brady to the system of Stuntebeck in order to automatically build a database storing extracted information about individual people. Stuntebeck and Brady do not explicitly disclose notifying an interested party for a data update. However, Robertson discloses monitoring changes in information about desired people or organizations with respect to the extracted information stored in the database, notifying an interested party of the detected change

and corresponding new information about the desired people or organization in response to the monitoring detecting a change, linking providing a communication link from a desired record in the database to a third party data system, updating the data in the desired record linked to the third party data system, and using the communication link, notifying the third party data system of the updated data in the desired record such that the third party data system employs the updated data in maintaining data of the third party data system (abstract, fig. 5, fig. 14, lines 12-21 in col. 3, lines 42-45 in col. 4, lines 48-54 in col. 6, lines 50-58 in col. 11, lines 25-44 in col. 12, and line 42 in col. 15 thru line 21 in col. 16). Therefore, based on Stuntebeck in view of Brady, and further in view of Robertson, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Robertson to the system of Stuntebeck in order to maintain databases synchronized, so that the information maintained in the databases is kept current and complete.

With respect to claim 19, Stuntebeck discloses storing the extracted information includes for each person, storing indications of name and job title of the person, and for each organization, storing indications of organization name and field of business of the organization, and querying the database by any combination of person name, job title, organization name and field of business (abstract, fig. 1, lines 9-54 in col. 2, lines 28-55 in col. 3, lines 28-54 in col. 4, and lines 11-40 in col. 5).

7. Claims 3, 4, 9, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,016) in view of Brady et al.

(U.S. Patent No. 6,463,430), and further in view of Polnerow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,813,006).

With respect to claim 3, Stuntebeck and Brady disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except enabling a sender to send a message to a named person based on name of the person absent the sender having an email address for the named person. However, Polnerow discloses utilizing the database as an e-mail communication system to each person named in the database, the e-mail communication system enabling a sender to send a message to a named person based on name of the person absent the sender having an email address for the named person (line 40 in col. 6 thru line 67 in col. 7). Therefore, based on Stuntebeck in view of Brady, and further in view of Polnerow, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Polnerow to the system of Stuntebeck in order to protect a privacy of a named person in the database.

With respect to claim 4, Stuntebeck and Brady disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except advertising. However, Polnerow discloses targeted advertising to a named person during access his record, the targeted advertising being based on information stored in the record (fig. 3, lines 22-57 in col. 4, and lines 34-61 in col. 5). Therefore, based on Stuntebeck in view of Brady, and further in view of Polnerow, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Polnerow to the system of Stuntebeck in order to provide a user information about products and services from vendors or

suppliers, so that vendors and suppliers make a profit by selling the products and services.

With respect to claim 9, Stuntebeck discloses providing a database storing information regarding people, extracting information regarding people and/or organizations from sites on a global computer network, and storing the extracted information in the database (abstract, fig. 1, lines 9-54 in col. 2, lines 28-55 in col. 3, and lines 28-54 in col. 4). Stuntebeck does not explicitly disclose extracting such information by using automated means. However, Brady discloses extracting unstructured information about individual people by using automated means, such as web crawlers, spiders, and Harvester and updating a database (line 56 in col. 6 thru line 26 in col. 7, lines 22-63 in col. 8, and line 53 in col. 20 thru line 11 in col. 21) so that the database storing such extracted information is automatically built and integrity of the information in the database is maintained. Therefore, based on Stuntebeck in view of Brady, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Brady to the system of Stuntebeck in order to automatically build a database storing extracted information about individual people. Stuntebeck and Brady do not explicitly disclose enabling a sender to send a message to a named person based on name of the person absent the sender having an email address for the named person. However, Polnerow teaches coupling an e-mail clearinghouse system to the database, in a manner that enables each person named in the database to receive e-mail in a respective e-mail box, in a manner free of the database indicating email addresses of people named in the database to email

message senders (line 40 in col. 6 thru line 67 in col. 7). Therefore, based on Stuntebeck in view of Brady, and further in view of Polnerow, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Polnerow to the system of Stuntebeck in order to protect a privacy of a named person in the database.

With respect to claim 12, Stuntebeck discloses enabling individuals to annotate, including updating, information stored in the database in a manner that maintains integrity of the information as extracted (lines 52-55 in col. 3).

With respect to claim 14, Stuntebeck and Brady disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except advertising. However, Polnerow discloses targeted advertising to a named person during access his record, the targeted advertising being based on information stored in the record (fig. 3, lines 22-57 in col. 4, and lines 34-61 in col. 5). Therefore, based on Stuntebeck in view of Brady, and further in view of Polnerow, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Polnerow to the system of Stuntebeck in order to provide a user information about products and services from vendors or suppliers, so that vendors and suppliers make a profit by selling the products and services.

8. Claims 10 and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,016) in view of Brady et al. (U.S. Patent

No. 6,463,430) and Polnerow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,813,006), and further in view of Robertson (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,369).

With respect to claim 10, Stuntebeck, Brady, and Polnerow disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except notifying a third party data system for a data update. However, Robertson discloses linking providing a communication link from a desired record in the database to a third party data system, updating the data in the desired record linked to the third party data system, and using the communication link, notifying the third party data system of the updated data in the desired record such that the third party data system employs the updated data in maintaining data of the third party data system (abstract, fig. 5, fig. 14, lines 12-21 in col. 3, lines 42-45 in col. 4, lines 48-54 in col. 6, lines 50-58 in col. 11, lines 25-44 in col. 12, and line 42 in col. 15 thru line 21 in col. 16). Therefore, based on Stuntebeck in view of Brady and Polnerow, and further in view of Robertson, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Robertson to the system of Stuntebeck in order to maintain databases synchronized, so that the information maintained in the databases is kept current and complete.

With respect to claim 13, the limitations of claim 13 are similar to the limitations of claim 10. Therefore, the limitations of claim 13 are rejected in the analysis of claim 10 above, and the claim is rejected on that basis.

9. Claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,016) in view of Brady et al. (U.S. Patent No.

Art Unit: 2162

6,463,430), Polnerow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,813,006), and Robertson (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,369), and further in view of Celik (U.S. Patent No. 6,654,768).

With respect to claim 11, Stuntebeck, Brady, Polnerow, and Robertson disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except updating a database regularly. However, Celik discloses synchronizing contact databases periodically and automatically (lines 25-33 in col. 10). Therefore, based on Stuntebeck in view of Brady, Polnerow, and Robertson, and further in view of Celik, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Celik to the system of Stuntebeck in order to maintain databases synchronized periodically, so that the information maintained in the databases is kept current and complete.

10. Claims 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stuntebeck et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,065,016) in view of Brady et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,463,430) and Robertson (U.S. Patent No. 6,269,369), and further in view of Polnerow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,813,006).

With respect to claim 17, Stuntebeck, Brady, and Robertson disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except enabling a sender to send a message to a named person based on name of the person absent the sender having an email address for the named person. However, Polnerow discloses utilizing the database as an email communication system to each person named in the information stored in the database, the email communication system enabling a sender to send a message to a

named person based on name of the person absent the sender having an email address for the named person (line 40 in col. 6 thru line 67 in col. 7). Therefore, based on Stuntebeck in view of Brady and Robertson, and further in view of Polnerow, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Polnerow to the system of Stuntebeck in order to protect a privacy of a named person in the database.

With respect to claim 18, Stuntebeck, Brady, and Robertson disclose the claimed subject matter as discussed above except advertising. However, Polnerow discloses advertising to a named person during access his record, the advertising being targeted based on information stored in the database (fig. 3, lines 22-57 in col. 4, and lines 34-61 in col. 5). Therefore, based on Stuntebeck in view of Brady and Robertson, and further in view of Polnerow, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the teachings of Polnerow to the system of Stuntebeck in order to provide a user information about products and services from vendors or suppliers, so that vendors and suppliers make a profit by selling the products and services.

Conclusion

11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joon H. Hwang whose telephone number is 571-272-4036. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00(M~F).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, JOHN E BREENE can be reached on 571-272-4107. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2162

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Joon Hwang
12/22/04



JEAN M. CORRIELUS
PRIMARY EXAMINER